



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,530	03/27/2006	Yoshiaki Shibata	450100-04817	4625
7590 06/23/2010				
William S. Frommer C/O Frommer Lawrence & Haug 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151			EXAMINER TEKLE, DANIEL T	
			ART UNIT 2621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/23/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/536,530

Applicant(s)

SHIBATA ET AL.

Examiner

DANIEL TEKLE

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 17, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argument regarding claim 1 limitation "selecting a conversion table corresponding to identified notation format of metadata" means; the examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed on the non-final office action, Ehrman et al. more than adequately provide support for the claim limitation. Therefore the examiner stands with the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ehrman et al. (US 6,775,680) further in view of Jain et al. (US 7,295,752).

Regarding Claim 1: Ehrman et al. and Jain et al. discloses a video signal processing apparatus for processing a video signal, comprising: a metadata notation format identification block for identifying a notation format of metadata written in a predetermined language (**column 3 lines 48-67 of Ehrman et al.**); a conversion table selection block for selecting a conversion table corresponding to said identified notation format of said metadata from among one or more conversion tables prepared in

advance (**column 3 lines 48-67 of Ehrman et al.**); a metadata notation format conversion block for converting notation format of metadata into a notation format compatible with said video signal processing apparatus on the basis of said selected conversion table (**column 3 lines 48-67 of Ehrman et al.**); and a processing control block for controlling processing associated with video signal on the basis of said metadata whose notation format has been converted (**column 8 lines 42-57 of Jain et al.**).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Jain et al. invention into Ehrman et al. invention in order to convert first application language into an application support by the playback device.

Regarding Claim 2: Jain et al. discloses a video signal processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein predetermined language is a markup language (**column 8 lines 42-57**).

Regarding Claim 3: Jain et al. discloses a video signal processing apparatus according to claim 2, wherein said markup language is XML (**column 8 lines 42-57**).

Regarding Claim 4: Jain et al. discloses a video signal processing apparatus according to claim 3, wherein said metadata notation format conversion block is an XSLT engine (**column 8 lines 42-57**).

Regarding Claim 5: Jain et al. discloses a video signal processing apparatus according to claim 2, wherein metadata notation formation identification block detects a tag from

metadata written in markup language, thereby identifying notation format of metadata
(Fig. 9 element 560).

Regarding Claim 6: Jain et al. discloses a video signal processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein video signal processing apparatus is a video signal recording apparatus for recording said video signal to a recording medium **(Fig. 1 element 140).**

Regarding Claim 7: Jain et al. discloses a video signal processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said video signal processing apparatus is a video signal reproduction apparatus for reproducing said video signal **(column 1 lines 40-49).**

Regarding Claim 8-10: Claim 8-10 are reject for the same subject matter as claim 1 discussed above.

Regarding Claim 11-14: Claim 11-14 are reject for the same subject matter as claim 2-5 respectively as discussed above.

Regarding Claim 15: Jain et al. discloses a video signal recording apparatus according to claim 10, further comprising: a conversion table selection block for selecting a conversion table corresponding to notation format of metadata at least compatible with video signal reproduction processing, from among one or more conversion tables **(column 8 lines 42-57)**, wherein metadata notation format conversion block converts at least notation format of generated metadata into a notation format compatible with said video signal reproduction apparatus on the basis of a conversion table selected by said conversion table selection block **(Fig. 9 element 560).**

Regarding Claim 16-23: Claim 16-23 are reject for the same subject matter as claim 1 discussed above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL TEKLE whose telephone number is (571)270-1117. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 5:00pm M-R and 7:30-4:00 Every other Friday..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on 571-272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621
/Daniel Tekle/
Examiner, Art Unit 2621